



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,945	01/22/2004	Dianne Ellis	02-299	5980

62753 7590 08/06/2007

VALERIE CALLOWAY
CHIEF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COUNSEL
POLYMER GROUP, INC.
9335 HARRIS CORNERS PARKWAY SUITE 300
CHARLOTTE, NC 28269

EXAMINER

SINGH, ARTI R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/762,945	Applicant(s) ELLIS ET AL.	
	Examiner Ms. Arti Singh	Art Unit 1771	

All Participants:

(1) Ms. Arti Singh.

(2) Mr. Ramon Hoch.

Status of Application: non-final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 July 2007

Time: 12:00-1:00 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Double Patenting and 102 rejection

Claims discussed:

1-7

Prior art documents discussed:

USPN 6734157

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Arti Singh/
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit 1771

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's counsel believes that the a few of the Double Patenting Rejections may not have a common inventor or assignee and will verify the same. With regard to the 102 rejection made over USPN 6734157 issued to Radwanski et al., Applicant's believes that the cited art and that of what Applicant proposes is that Applicant invention is disposable and the cited reference teach a wash and reuse product. Once the amendment has been sent in, and updated search shall be performed..